



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

Two payer of newe shoes, and a payer of pumpes, 6s 6d; two payer of old shoes, 1s 6d; fether bed, boulder, and matt, 3l 8s 6d: 3 payer of pillowe beare[r]s, 6l 6s 6d; 2 payer of flaxen shee[t]s, 1l 4s 6d; 6 towells, 3s; a payer of courser sheets, 6s; one sheete, 3s; 9 napkins, 4s—Summa totall. 27l 13s 8d.

At the foot of Barker's answer is a list of books and effects which he admits having received. It contains most of the items enumerated in the schedule to the libel, together with the following books which are not in the schedule. Barker's list is full of mistakes, and is evidently drawn up by an illiterate pleader; several of his items defy attempts to identify.

Farnabe Bartholomeus uppon the Counsell; Ascams plaine way of Teachin[ge]<sup>1</sup>; Everinus Phisicke; Roberts uppon the 130 Psalme; Drusius his Apothegmes; A marriage prayer; Leyes and Dods Sermons; Tossanius Compendium<sup>2</sup>; A Table of Scripture; A Short Catechism; Dennisons Sermon; Coelius his Institutions; Goffs Sermons; Hornes Sermons; A smalle booke of meditacions; Goodwin uppon Moyses and Aron; An Hebrew booke; A Greek grammar; Paulus Oretius<sup>3</sup>; Pastinus his Expositions; Wilsons rules<sup>4</sup>; Wilsons tracte; A Dicksionary uppon the Revelacion; A smalle Treatis of our Saviours Descention to Hell<sup>5</sup>; Balthasarius Lexicon; Yeates Sermons; Desputerius<sup>6</sup>; Conradus Phisicks; Rodulphus uppon the Proverbs; A Cynnocticall Annotation; Ricardus uppon Luke; Ricktherus uppon the Scripture; Brandimlierius.

2. *Letters of John Quincy Adams to Alexander Hamilton  
Everett, 1811-1837*

(Second Installment.)<sup>7</sup>

XVI.

(Private and Confidential)

A. H. EVERETT Esq<sup>r</sup> New-York

WASHINGTON 28. May 1825<sup>8</sup>

*My dear Sir.*

Accept my thanks for your Letter of the 12<sup>th</sup> inst<sup>t</sup> and for its enclosure. I had not the least uneasiness that the latter should remain

<sup>1</sup> Roger Ascham, *The Scholemaster or Plaine Way of Teaching*.

<sup>2</sup> Daniel Tossanus, *A Synopsis or Compendium of the Fathers* (London, 1635).

<sup>3</sup> Qu. ? Orosius.

<sup>4</sup> Sir Thomas Wilson, *The Rule of Reason* (London, 1552, etc.).

<sup>5</sup> Probably Adam Hill, *The Defence of the Article: Christ descended to Hell* (London, 1592).

<sup>6</sup> Qu. ? Johannes Despauterius, *De Accentibus et Punctis*.

<sup>7</sup> For the letters of 1811-1818, I.-XV., see the preceding number of the REVIEW, XI. 88-116.

<sup>8</sup> Among President Adams's first nominations had been that of A. H. Everett as minister to Spain.

in possession of your brother; but it was too full of egotism, for me to be willing that it should fall into unfriendly hands. I am also much gratified with the scraps of newspapers, containing some of your publications the last Autumn.

If the failure of the Union ticket at the late Boston election,<sup>1</sup> is to be regretted, it is not to be wondered at, considering the manner in which it was composed. "Nullum Numen Adest, ni sit Prudentia."

It is customary for Ministers Plenipotentiary, on delivering their Credential Letters into the hands of the Sovereign to whom they are directed, to address him in a short speech; more or less formal, according to the dispositions of the Speaker and Hearer. With this custom you will do well to conform. The Address is complimentary, and adapted to the time and circumstances of its delivery. One or two instances have occurred here during the late Administration of Ministers who read their Addresses from written papers but this is not a general usage, nor as I ever heard the practice at the Spanish Court. The Minister reports to his Government the substance, and sometimes the words of his Address—and also the purport of the Answer, which he receives to it.

I enclose a Letter from Mr Brown, at Paris.<sup>2</sup> He will shew you a copy of a recent Instruction to Mr Middleton,<sup>3</sup> relating to the Affairs of Spain and South-America. I pray you to write me freely and confidentially as often as you shall find it convenient and agreeable. My best wishes will follow you, for the success of your Mission, and for your personal comfort and welfare.

Yours affectionately J. Q. ADAMS.

XVII.

ALEXANDER H. EVERETT Esq! Boston

WASHINGTON 15. April 1830.

*Dear Sir.*

I received a few weeks since, and have read with great satisfaction your pamphlet upon the British Opinions on the protecting system<sup>4</sup>; which are indeed the opinions of many among ourselves. I had read those wise lucubrations of the Edinburgh and Quarterly Reviewers,<sup>5</sup> which you have so effectually discussed, and had remarked the tone of dogmatism and the visage of Wisdom with which the Sophist of Dun

<sup>1</sup> The election of representatives from Boston to the Massachusetts legislature, May 10, had resulted in the choice of twenty regular Federalists, and in the defeat of a "union ticket" prepared by the Republicans and such Federalists as would join with them.

<sup>2</sup> James Brown of Louisiana, minister to France 1823 to 1829.

<sup>3</sup> Henry Middleton of South Carolina, minister to Russia 1820 to 1830.

<sup>4</sup> *British Opinions upon the Protective System* (Boston, 1830); reprinted from the *North American Review*, XXX. 160.

<sup>5</sup> "The American Tariff," *Edinburgh Review*, December, 1828; "Commerce of the United States and West Indies," *Quarterly Review*, January, 1829.

Edin dealt out his ignorance and absurdity. But the exposure of them in your Article surpasses my expectation. Your brother informs me that the author of the Edinburgh Article is a Lecturer upon Political Economy.<sup>1</sup> I take it for granted he will see either the Article in the North American, or your pamphlet, and that we shall hear from him again on the subject. Handled as he has been it is scarcely possible that he should reply without falling into a passion—and then he will make an auditory to witness his discomfiture.

You quote in a note, a paragraph in my last Message to Congress,<sup>2</sup> with a question of its correctness. My position was not intended as you conjecture, for particular or local application; and was disconnected entirely from any reference to Navigation. I believe the difference between us must be found in the definition of the words *value* and *equivalents*. You are so much deeper in the theories of political economy than I have been, that I distrust my own judgment, and suspect I may have uttered an error, where I should rather have expected to be charged with having propounded a truism.

During the twelve years which succeeded my last return from Europe, my time was so totally absorbed in official Studies and duties that I had none left for devotion to general Literature; nor even to pursue the progress of the Science of Political Economy. After reading your controversy with Malthus,<sup>3</sup> I had set him aside, as very doubtful authority; and although I had for several years Ricardo's book upon my shelf, I never found a moment to look into it, nor even into that of our Countryman Mr Raymond. Neither of these Books is now within my reach—nor Say, nor my friend Count De Stutt Tracy; and my utter inability to follow the course of the renowned Periodicals, till within the last four Months has left me so to seek on this momentous subject that I knew nothing even of Malthus's Definitions,<sup>4</sup> till I perceived in this new Article of your's that there was such a book, and that it had been reviewed by you, in the North-American. I then hunted up the North American for last April,<sup>5</sup> and there to be sure I find much discussion upon the value of value, and some disagreement between you and Mr Malthus about it. I discover moreover that there is a book in sundry Chapters, called "a Critical Dissertation upon Value"<sup>6</sup> which, if I should ever get a sight of it, I hope will not perform the office of that antient Judge in the Paradise Lost who "by decision more embroils the fray". My meaning of the word Value was much nearer the surface.

<sup>1</sup> J. R. M'Culloch.

<sup>2</sup> A paragraph affirming it to be "a general law of prosperous commerce, that the real value of exports should by a small, and only a small, balance exceed that of imports, that balance being a permanent addition to the wealth of the nation." See *North American Review*, XXX. 198.

<sup>3</sup> A. H. Everett, *New Ideas on Population, with Remarks on the Theories of Malthus and Godwin* (Boston, 1823, 1826).

<sup>4</sup> *Definitions in Political Economy* (London, 1827).

<sup>5</sup> "Political Economy," *North American Review*, XXVIII. 368.

<sup>6</sup> [Samuel Bailey], *A Critical Dissertation on the Nature, Measures and Causes of Value* (London, 1825).

I take this occasion to assure you of the pleasure with which I learnt that you had taken the *North American* into your own hands. I thought it was falling into bad management, especially upon certain topics of our revolutionary history and of present domestic policy. I do not flatter myself that I shall be able to concur in all the doctrines political, metaphysical or poetical, which will mark the future career of this miscellany; but I shall be relieved from the apprehension that it will become the medium for the circulation of time-serving morality or perverted history.<sup>1</sup>

Your brother mentioned to me, that you had applied to him for an Article for the July number of the Review, upon the Tape-worm debate in the Senate of the United States, which is voiding all the sense and nonsense, all the wit and dulness, all the Patriotism and Scoundrelism of that body, with its commingled fragrance and fetidity to salute the nostrils of the Nation, and he asked me to undertake this service in his stead. I desired him to excuse me<sup>2</sup>; first from a doubt whether the whole worm would ever be evacuated, Secondly from a probability that its parcels will be still appearing at least during all the present Session of Congress, but thirdly and chiefly because I believed such an Article as I should write, would not suit your views, nor perhaps the temporal Interests of the Review itself. If I should write the Article it would be too bold for the temper of the Times, and would adapt itself to no one of the political parties militant. It would deal with them all more in truth than, in policy, and would mask neither the Virginia and Kentucky Resolutions of 1798 and 1799, nor the Hartford Convention Resolutions of 1815. Nor the Colleton<sup>3</sup> and Edgefield<sup>4</sup> Resolutions of 1829. They are all Chips of the same Block, and there is no great political party in this Country but at some time or other has made to itself a God, of this "inutile lignum".

I know not whether your brother or you will even think it advisable fully to expose the mutual surrender of the Public Lands to the West, and of the American System to the South, both at the expense of all the rest of the Union, of which this debate has revealed the project. This is the practical application of the doctrine that any one State has a right to nullify any act of Congress which the State Legislature may please to pronounce Unconstitutional. This is the Key to the creed that Robbery is an attribute of Sovereignty, and that a State may declare itself the owner of all the Lands within its borders. Georgia by virtue of this doctrine, nullifies the Laws of Congress and the Treaties that promise protection to Indian tribes; South-Carolina nullifies the Tariff.

<sup>1</sup> From 1824 to 1830 Jared Sparks had edited the *North American Review*.

<sup>2</sup> Mr. Adams seems never to have contributed to the *North American Review*.

<sup>3</sup> Reference is probably made to "An Address of sundry Citizens of Colleton district to the people of the state of South Carolina," drawn up June 12, 1828 (the Walterborough address). See *Niles' Register*, XXXIV. 288.

<sup>4</sup> The Edgefield, South Carolina, resolutions of July 26, 1828, are found *ibid.*, XXXV. 60.

Missouri nullifies all the Land Laws—and takes the Lands into her own keeping. They all nullify the Power of the Supreme Court. The Executive of the Union bows in submission; and majorities of both Houses present that beautiful Spectacle of a Government disrobing itself, of its own powers. Meantime Massachusetts is mulcted in a Million of dollars, because her Legislature and judges nullified an Act of Congress sixteen or seventeen years since, and the Hartford Convention, for *recommending* the nullification of certain other Acts of the same body, is turned over to an Independent Court Martial and the second Section. Whether you will take this view of the Senatorial debate or not, it is in my mind by far the most important light in which it is to be considered; for if the sacrifice of the property in the Public Lands, and of the cause and interest of free labour, is not already consummated beyond redemption, nothing can save them but a complete and fearless exposure of the nefarious conspiracy now in the full tide of successful experiment against them.

For the sake of the Union, and of honest Politics, I rejoice that this Subject must occupy, and summon to action all the faculties of your mind, and all the virtues of your heart—if not as a Reviewer, at least as a Legislator—and this is one of my Reasons for congratulating our Country and our native Commonwealth upon your Election to the Senate of the State.<sup>1</sup> I have just received your "*Politics of Europe*"<sup>2</sup>—but have only space to assure you of the continued regard and attachment of your friend

J. Q. ADAMS.

#### XVIII.

ALEXANDER H. EVERETT Esq<sup>r</sup> Boston

WASHINGTON 11. May 1830

Dear Sir

They used to tell a Story of a Bailly in some village of France, who upon the passage of Henri quatre through his jurisdiction felt himself under the awkward necessity of apologizing for the omission of a cannonade in his honour. He commenced a set Speech to His Majesty by assuring him that there were seven reasons why they had not welcomed his arrival by the sound of the Cannon—the first of which was that they had no Cannon to fire. Whereupon Le Roi Henri gravely observed to the village Magistrate that he would dispense with the assignment of the six remaining Reasons, being altogether satisfied with the first.

I have at least as many reasons as the worthy Bailly, for withholding the promise to furnish you regularly with an Article for the successive numbers of your Review; and I hope you will be as indulgent to me, as the Béarnois was to him, when I say that the condition of my health is the first. And as a portion of my health, there must be included a certain waywardness of disposition, humouring caprices in the

<sup>1</sup> Everett served in the Massachusetts legislature from 1830 to 1835.

<sup>2</sup> *North American Review*, XXX. 399, Everett's third article of that title for that journal.

application of my time—So that instead of refusing like Shakespear's Knight to give Reasons upon compulsion, I am more likely to give them in no other manner. I hope and trust it may be in my power to supply you occasionally with an Article; but whether for so soon as October, may be doubtful. I intreat you therefore to make provision for that number, without depending upon me; and if I should have one prepared so that it might come into that number, it shall be at your service to employ then or for the number next ensuing as may suit your convenience.

The subject upon which my own inclination at present dwells, as that which it would be most agreeable to me to treat would be a biographical account of our late Charge d'Affaires at the Court of Brazil, William Tudor. Biography, does not come strictly within the plan of your Review; but it seems to me that a short account of the life of him who was the founder, first proprietor and Editor of the work itself, far from being out of place, would be peculiarly suited to it. The establishment and continuance to this time of the North-American Review, forms itself an Epocha in the history of our Literature, the occasion of advertising to which would naturally present itself in a Life of Mr Tudor; and some critical, perhaps some political observations would naturally arise from an appropriate notice of the Articles in the Review written by him, as well as of his other published writings.

Mr Tudor's Mother and Sister Mrs Stewart, are my next-door neighbours at this place. In compliance with a request from them, I have written a short notice for the National Intelligencer, but which is a mere newspaper Article. The one which I should propose for the Review, would perhaps be as long as one of your usual Articles. But to prepare it I should want much information which is to be obtained only from the friends and acquaintance of Mr Tudor in Boston. If you approve of my design, I shall need your assistance to procure it.

I am very glad to learn that Charles is entering upon the field with you, and particularly that he begins with Grahame's history.<sup>1</sup> It is incomparably the best account that has ever been published of our early Settlements, and as he is the first historian who has done Justice to our forefathers I hope the North-American Review will be the first to do ample Justice to him.

I thank you for the kind expression of your opinions and dispositions with regard to the new trust in which we both stand associated in the Government of the concerns of our University.<sup>2</sup> Some improvement in the regulation of its affairs has been generally thought necessary, and expected by the public. Mr Quincy has also been sensible of this necessity, and as I have understood is impressed with the Spirit rather

<sup>1</sup> Grahame's *History of the United States* was reviewed by Charles Francis Adams in the *North American Review*, XXXII. 174.

<sup>2</sup> President Adams had lately been chosen a member of the Board of Overseers of Harvard University.

of renovation than of innovation. I shall be happy to give him for that purpose all the aid in my power.

I had fully intended and expected to be at my residence in Quincy a month earlier than this; but a very comfortable situation here, and an obstinate Catarrhal complaint succeeded by rhumatic symptoms, have detained me for some weeks, though I still purpose to migrate northward before the close of this Month. I shall rely upon the pleasure of seeing you upon my return, and shall be glad to receive the subsequent numbers of the North-American Review, there, rather than here.

Do you intend to suffer the Article in the last number, upon the Jefferson Correspondence,<sup>1</sup> to pass for the New-England critical and political *judgment* concerning that work?

Yours faithfully

J. Q. ADAMS.

### XIX.

ALEXANDER H. EVERETT Esq<sup>r</sup> Boston.

WASHINGTON 24 May 1830.<sup>2</sup>

Dear Sir.

I reply to your Letter of the 17<sup>th</sup> though at the eve of my return to Quincy, where I hope to arrive at a time when you will be much occupied with public business. But as the Session of the Legislature will be short I expect to see you not long after my arrival,—and we may then freely converse upon topics too comprehensive to be discussed in Letters of *conscionable* dimensions.

I had no intention to write an Article upon the Jefferson Correspondence for the Review, but I was certainly not satisfied with the Article upon it in the last number. Mr Jefferson had a *mind*. I did hope to see in the North-American Review at least traces of a *Mind* capable of grappling with it. In the published Article, there is abundance of liberality. But the errors of Mr Jefferson in Religion and Politics are not of that harmless Class which may be encountered with equivocal opposition or hesitating dissent. There is a mode of defending which has the effect of surrendering a Cause. The Reviewer professes to disapprove some of Mr Jefferson's Religious opinions, but does not tell us what they are—but he approves his practice and recommendation of free enquiry, or free thinking—admires his total disregard of all human authority, and his studious avoidance of quoting the opinion of any other as the motive or foundation of his own; and is half-inclined to regard this lofty consciousness of superiority over other minds as a new discovery in religious morals.

<sup>1</sup> Article in the *North American Review*, XXX. 511, for April, 1830, by A. Ritchie, on the Randolph edition of the *Memoirs and Correspondence of Thomas Jefferson*.

<sup>2</sup> Most of this letter, and one passage in the next, was printed, without mention of the person addressed, in *Old and New* for February, 1873, VII. 135–136. Nevertheless, for the sake of continuity, it is here reprinted.

The writer of the Article, favours his readers with much commonplace argument, upon the reasonableness of free and unlimited enquiry, and commends Mr Jefferson, for advising his young friend to examine the first-principles of *natural* religion for himself, and not to adopt without examination the principles of *another*.

It is not difficult to discern where all this leads. The Reviewer does not or will not discern it. But observe—*Examination* is one thing—*Rejection* of all human authority is another. Mr Jefferson examined much less than he rejected. He never examined the evidences of Christianity. He rejected it as an imposture. Rejected it, not by the dictate of his own mind, but upon mere perusal of the bible, under the influence of the infidel School of his own and the immediately preceding age—Bolingbroke, Hume, Voltaire, Diderot, and the rest of that gang. What he meant by examination, was treating the Bible like Tooke's Pantheon—studying all the fashionable atheists of the age; and never looking into the writers in favour of Christianity. So far was Mr Jefferson from encouraging or recommending examination into the truth of the Christian Religion, that he founded his University, with a cold, professed, and systematic exclusion of all theological studies from the institution.

He who recommends to a young man, a total rejection of human authority in the pursuit of his enquiries after religious truth, ought if not in Modesty, at least in consistency to include his own authority with the rest. And perhaps it would be quite as good advice to the natural impetuosity of youth to guard the juvenile enquirer against the possible illusions of his own mind, as against the opinions of *all* the rest of mankind. The rejection of all human authority, in the formation of our religious opinions, is as unphilosophical, as the blindest confidence in an infallible Church. Examination is good; but it must be thorough. An University without theological Studies, however favourable to free thinking is but a sorry commentary upon free Inquiry.

Mr Jefferson was not willing that all his opinions upon Religion should be known to the world in his Life-time. He sometimes intrenched himself in his Castle, and insisted upon his right to keep his opinions to himself. When Dr Priestley was a *political* Apostle for him, he was prepared to pass for a Unitarian, and preferred the moral precepts of Jesus to those of Moses, or of Socrates or of any other antient philosopher. But he was always as hostile to the whole system of Christianity as the temper of popular opinion in this Country would endure. He occasionally *betrayed* his belief in the independent existence of matter, and he had no faith in a future state of retribution, though he never very explicitly avowed this part of his doctrines.

His opinions upon the judiciary, and his rancour against all judges, deserve searching scrutiny and fearless exposure, nearly as much as his religious infidelity. And the nullification doctrine, which may shiver this Union to atoms is the child of his own conception. It was like most of his political opinions a doctrine adopted and propagated to promote

his own views and prospects of ambition, at a particular time; and did effectually promote them. As to his Construction of the Constitution and his tender regard for State Rights, his annexation of Louisiana to the Union, by Acts of Congress, with his signature, and his Cumberland Road, are quite as authoritative of what he could *do*, as the Virginia and Kentucky Resolutions of what he could *say*.

Mr Jefferson's *infidelity*, his *anti-judicialism*, and his *nullification*, were three great and portentous Errors. I did hope that the Cause of the Cross, the Cause of *Justice*, and the Cause of the American Union, would have found in the North-American Review, a head and heart capable of defending them against the insidious and therefore more formidable assault of his posthumous Correspondence. As to the Lamb-like meekness with which the remnants of the Hartford Convention stomach his new, and gross denunciations of them, let it pass, if so my friend shall think just and fair, for *liberality*.

That these great Errors should be probed to the bottom, and exposed in their naked nature I do believe to be highly necessary. We have had recent experience here, of the use which some of the most desperate profligates upon Earth are making of his name and authority, to kindle a conflagration in the confusion of which they may consummate their schemes of public robbery, and enthrall the free blood of this Union in bondage to its Slavery. Now is not a time for New-England to close her eyes, upon what is passing in this Confederation before them, nor to wink at the jugglery practising upon her simplicity, under the name, the countenance and the authority of Jefferson.

For the Mulatto doctrine of political economy, which proves that two thirds of the federal revenue consists of a tax upon the *export* of Cotton, I commend you to the speech of Mr M'Duffie now in a course of publication in the National Intelligencer. You will see that this rare political economist falls foul of you among others. He is also one of the champions of nullification, and tells some of our good natured members that if Congress will not repeal the Tariff, the Legislature of South-Carolina will. I am told that Mr Gorham and Mr Davis<sup>1</sup> answered both his argument and his swaggering, but their speeches have not yet been published. I have heard much also of a Speech of your brother's—but that was perhaps on the Indian question, which is prejudged. I have not seen him, I think for more than a Month. He is so much and so well engaged that I would not intrude upon him.

Your faithful friend

J. Q. ADAMS.

XX.

ALEXANDER H. EVERETT. Esqr Boston—

QUINCY 18. Sept<sup>r</sup> 1831.

*My dear Sir.*

In compliance with my promise and your request I send you the Manuscript which I had prepared in reply to Mr H. G. Otis and his

<sup>1</sup> Benjamin Gorham and John Davis, of Massachusetts.

twelve confederates, or rather to himself alone, he being on that occasion my only real adversary.<sup>1</sup> It was written under circumstances so deeply afflictive and feelings so far beyond the reach of his pigmy Soul to excite, that it would not be fit for public inspection without severe revisal. It was never intended for publication without such revisal, and I now commit in friendly confidence its perusal to you, only with the condition that you will return it, with all the passages marked, of which you would advise the omission, and with such other observations as your friendship and judgment may suggest.

I am well pleased that your proposed Article upon Nullification in the North American Review, should be postponed, to embrace the examination of Mr Calhoun's new Theory, in connection with my Oration.<sup>2</sup> This has already been severely criticised from various quarters, and among the rest from Head-quarters. I am told that a critic in the Salem Gazette, charges me with having borrowed my expositions of the *united* Declaration of Independence from Mr Dane. I did not borrow them from Mr Dane, but from the Paper itself, and from personal knowledge of the Time. Mr Dane had the same opinion drawn from the same Sources: he no more borrowed it from me than I borrowed it from him, as is well known to Judge Story. But if you will read with attention what Mr Dane says upon the subject, in his Supplement,<sup>3</sup> you will see an intelligible concession that this doctrine was somewhat overlooked at the Hartford Convention.

Mr Dane has so nobly redeemed that error, both by this concession, and by his magnificent benefaction to our University, that base would be the heart which could reproach him with it now; and among my motives for suppressing hitherto my enclosed manuscript, not the least has been, a reluctance, at baring thus to the bone, in the face of the world, the character and proceedings of an Assembly of which we know that he was an unwilling member.

I have sent to Mr Calhoun a copy of my Eulogy upon Mr Monroe, and with it one of my Oration, which I had not at first done, lest he should think it was meant as a cast of the glove. With the two pamphlets, I have written him a few lines disclaiming all other than friendly intentions in offering them, but with the hope that his answer may give opening to a further exposition by himself of his present Sentiments with regard to the Union.

<sup>1</sup> The pamphlet alluded to is the famous *Correspondence between John Quincy Adams, Esquire, President of the United States, and several Citizens of Massachusetts, concerning the Charge of a Design to dissolve the Union* (Boston, 1829) put forth by Otis and others. The manuscript alluded to, Adams's "Reply to the Appeal of the Massachusetts Federalists," first saw the light of print\* in 1877, when published by Mr. Henry Adams in his *Documents relating to New England Federalism*.

<sup>2</sup> Adams's oration at Quincy, July 4, 1831, in which he inveighed against the nullifiers.

<sup>3</sup> Appendix to Vol. IX. of Dane's *Abridgment*.

Mr Madison's Letter to your brother<sup>1</sup> upon the Virginia Resolutions of 1798. and 1799. also contains a concession which I deem of no trivial importance. "It may often happen, says he, as experience proves, that erroneous constructions, not anticipated, may not be sufficiently guarded against in the language used." I consider him also as substantially admitting that the great object of those Resolutions was *electioneering* for Mr Jefferson. That this was their great object I have always believed, and as he remarks it was effectually answered. Neither your brother,<sup>2</sup> nor Mr Webster has ventured in treating of those Resolutions *now*, to analyse them with a critical scrutiny of their language and import as affected by this purpose for which they were prepared; to which they were adapted, and by which they were stimulated. I know not whether it will be within *your* plan to subject them to the discipline of *that* investigation, but I will not disguise the opinion, that no unanswerable refutation of the nullification principle can be exhibited without it. I presume it might be conducted with all the respect, and even delicacy so justly due to Mr Madison.

Mr Jefferson too is entitled to great Respect—though after the conduct of his last days and the posthumous publication of his writings, delicacy towards him from New-England, is an exemplification of something more than Christian meekness and forbearance. The Review of that work in the North-American, I have heard was written at the solicitation of his grand-daughter's husband, and that is the best way that I know of accounting for its character. "Time, (says Voltaire)" which vindicates the characters of great men, finishes by "rendering even their faults respectable.[""] Of such respectability Mr Jefferson has a very unreasonable share, and if the prudent servility of New-England Literature suffers it to accumulate without energetic remonstrance *she* will feel its consequences, in every vein and artery and sinew and bone of her population. Your brother has noticed his courteous reason for preserving the Union—to keep New-England, as a plaything to buffet, and quarrel with; and the complimentary anecdotes about leading New-England federalists in the *Ana*—but I have seen those same federalists, not ashamed of linking themselves to the crazy Chariot wheels of My Lord Mayor, that he might ride over my neck, at the moment when he thought me prostrate forever; and silent—silent—chap-fallen as the skull of Yorick the King's jester, under charges in these writings of Jefferson, that their darling champions were bribed by British gold.

You will find in the enclosed manuscript that I have handled him not quite so gently as your brother Edward. He deserves nothing but rigorous Justice from *me*—and that he shall always have. He was a great Man—but his characteristic vice was duplicity—a vice which originated in his overweening passion for popularity, and his consequent

<sup>1</sup> Letter of August, 1830, to Edward Everett. See it in *Letters and other Writings of James Madison*, IV. 95–105.

<sup>2</sup> Edward Everett's article on the "Debate in the Senate", *North American Review*, XXXI. 462.

desire to be all things to all men. As to his Constitutional puritanism—to say nothing of the Cumberland Road, the man who with the Oath of God upon his Soul, after writing his Letter to Dr Sibley upon the Louisiana purchase, could sign the Bills extending the Laws of the United States over that Territory comes with an ill-grace to claim a narrow Construction of the Powers of Congress.

I need not add the assurance or the injunction of perfect Confidence in which this Letter is written, by your friend

J. Q. ADAMS.

XXI.

ALEXANDER H. EVERETT Esq.<sup>r</sup> Boston

QUINCY 18. August 1832

*Dear Sir.*

It may not be in my power to meet you according to your kind invitation at 4 in the afternoon of Monday, but I shall probably visit Boston in the course of the week, and will then not fail to call at your house, where I shall be happy to converse with you on the subject to which your Letter refers. I regretted much last year that the Anti-Masons of this Commonwealth, thought it necessary to nominate and support for Governor a Candidate other than the incumbent,<sup>1</sup> and expressly declined their nomination, declaring my approbation of the general course of his Administration. Could I now contribute to his re-election for the ensuing year, I would most cheerfully yield every suitable aid in my power.

With regard to the Electoral ticket for the Presidential Election, I incline to the opinion that having reference to both my Situations past and present I ought not to meddle with it at all. I have been earnestly solicited to deliver a public address to the Anti-Masons, to attend as a delegate at their projected Convention at Worcester, or to countenance them merely by my presence; all which I have declined. At the Election of 1824. it was a received Moral and Political Maxim of the National Republicans, that Caucusing by members of Congress, for the Election of a President was improper; and virtually forbidden by the Constitution, which disqualifies them from serving in the Electoral Colleges. I was of that opinion myself and avowed it. I have seen no occasion to change the opinion, and see none now.

With respect to conciliating the Anti-Masons in this Commonwealth, though it is rather late for the National Republicans to begin, it may be better late than never. I most sincerely and heartily wish that they would. The National Republicans of this Commonwealth have not understood—they do not and I fear *will not* understand the State of the

<sup>1</sup> Levi Lincoln. The history of antimasonry in Massachusetts, and of Adams's relation to it, may be followed in Dr. Charles McCarthy's monograph, "The Antimasonic Party," in the *Annual Report of the American Historical Association for 1902*, I. 516-525.

Masonic and Anti-Masonic Question. About a year ago the Grand Lodge of Rhode-Island, published a formal *defence of Masonry*, in which they said they could not tell whether Morgan had been murdered or not for *they knew nothing about it*. I have read a declaration published on the last day of the last year, signed by twelve hundred Masons of this our own State who speak of a high state of excitement which *had been* in the public mind, carried to it "by the *partial and inflammatory* representations of *certain offences* committed by a *few misguided members* of the Masonic Institution in a Sister State". The National Republicans of Massachusetts know nothing about these *certain Offences*, but they have for two years past taken most especial care to turn out of office every Anti-Mason upon whom they could lay their hands, all the while, bitterly complaining of the persecuting and proscriptive Spirit of political Anti-Masonry.

The cause of Anti-Masonry must and will survive the next Presidential-Election. And if the National Republicans of Massachusetts really wish for the co-operation of Anti-Masons, I have no doubt they can obtain it. Whether they can agree upon a ticket for the Presidential Election now so near at hand is doubtful in my mind, but I take it for granted that for this time the National Republica: can carry their Elections without them. The Masonic Declaration of last Winter, to which I have alluded considers the Anti-Masonic excitement as having subsided, and they certainly did appear then to have lost ground in this State, and at least to have gained none in the States of New-York and Pennsylvania. There is now an apparent Union of the two parties in New-York, but whether it will be cordial or successful is very problematical. The National Republicans there, are more sanguine than the Anti-Masons, and there are wounds between them not easily to be healed. You know how it is here.

Upon the Subject of Anti-Masonry, I have not suffered myself to be excited, although there has been no lack of provocations. But I *do* know something about the *Masonic* Murder of Morgan, and the *Cluster* of Crimes perpetrated for the suppression of his Book. I know something also of the Laws, Oaths, Obligations and Penalties of Masonry, and I have not been unobservant of their practical effect, from murder under the sealed obligations down to the prevarication of pretending that to have the throat cut from ear to ear *means* expulsion from the Lodge. If the Masonic controversy were now raging in Cochin-China, and the name of Hiram Abiff had never been heard upon this Continent, the Subject would be worthy of investigation as a philosophical enquiry into the mysteries of human nature. I have endeavoured to consider it as a question upon the first principles of morals. I have sought for the facts from the Masonic as well as from the Anti-Masonic side, and have read Henry Brown as well as Avery Allyn and David Bernard.<sup>1</sup> Coll

<sup>1</sup> Henry Brown, *Narrative of the Anti-Masonick Excitement in the Western Part of the State* (Batavia, New York, 1829); David Bernard, *Light on Masonry* (Utica, 1829).

Stone's Letters,<sup>1</sup> which you have doubtless seen, were addressed to me, in consequence of enquiries which I had addressed to a brother Mason of his in Philadelphia, which were communicated to him. Stone is a Knight Templar, and as you know a very ardent National Republican. His Masonic Spirit lingers with him through his whole book, but he is an honest man, unperverted, even by the fifth libation; and a bold one, or he never would have dared to proclaim the Truths contained in those Letters. I ask your particular attention to the Letters from 21. to 25 inclusive, and to the 48<sup>th</sup> and I wish you would recommend the perusal of them, to those of your National Republican friends who are accessible to reason upon this Subject. I abstain purposely from any public manifestation of opinion upon this topic, to avoid all appearance of interfering with the approaching Presidential Election.

Faithfully your friend

J. Q. ADAMS.

XXII.

ALEXANDER H. EVERETT Esq<sup>r</sup> Boston

QUINCY 23. July 1833

*My dear Sir*

I have delayed answering your friendly Letter of the 12<sup>th</sup> inst<sup>t</sup> under an expectation of the pleasure of meeting you in Boston, or here, and of conversing with you freely on the subject to which it relates.

But as this may be farther delayed, I write to relieve you from all suspense with regard to the arrangements which you may deem it expedient to make.

Reflection tends from day to day to confirm my impressions against consenting to be a candidate for the Office of Governor of the Commonwealth. My principal objections arise from a conviction that the questions between Masonry and Anti-Masonry will constitute the main objects of political controversy within the Commonwealth during the ensuing year; and that in the operation which they must have upon the Affairs of the State, I could not possibly hold the balance between the parties so as to give satisfaction to the People of the State, or indeed to either of the parties, in collision with each other. A sharply contested Election, succeeded by a turbulent administration, and a furious renewal of the contest at the end of the year, is all that I could expect for myself or anticipate for the public. "*Le jeu ne vaut pas la chandelle*".

I am as you know, of long standing an outlaw to the federal party and especially to its leaders in this State. I am worse than an Outlaw in the estimation of the Masons and Masonic Party; and they constitute between them three fourths of the People. Concurring with the general Opinions of the National Republicans with regard to the interests involved in the Administration of the general Government I may hope to represent them with Satisfaction to them and to myself in Congress;

<sup>1</sup> William L. Stone, *Letters on Masonry and Antimasonry, addressed to Hon. John Quincy Adams* (New York, 1832).

it is morally certain that I could not represent them to their Satisfaction as Governor of the State, and I perceive no attainable end, of inducement to try an experiment with anticipation approaching to certainty of its ultimate failure. Here, in my Solitude, disburthened of all responsibility for public measures I enjoy a tranquility for which no political elevation encumbered with its cares and vexations can compensate; and whatever of selfishness there may be in this Consideration, I see no stake of public welfare, to be contended for, which should forbid me to indulge it. Feeble and inefficient as my Services may be in the Legislative Councils of the Union, I am convinced they would be more so, in the Executive of the Commonwealth.

I am, Dear Sir, ever faithfully your friend

J. Q. ADAMS.

XXIII.

ALEXANDER H. EVERETT Esq Boston

*My dear Sir.*

QUINCY 24. September 1833

In accepting the nomination recently tendered to me by the Convention held at Boston,<sup>1</sup> I deemed it proper to state for the Consideration of the People of the Commonwealth the Principles upon which I acceded to that measure—the only Principles upon which I would accept of any nomination or of the Office to which the nomination applied. The first of these Principles was that of merging all party Spirit and feeling, in the general interest of the whole Commonwealth. The next was contributing as far as might be in my Power, to heal the divisions of party, to promote the harmony of the Union, and to maintain the Industry of Freedom and the purity of the Constitution.

You have perfectly understood the meaning of this pledge; and you are well acquainted with my principles in reference to this subject from other and anterior sources. Intelligent men cannot and candid men will not misunderstand them. To others no explanation or developement of them would be satisfactory. On full deliberation, appretiating the motive of your communication, and estimating the high value of your friendship, I can only repeat what I then said; adding merely the assurance that I am accustomed to understand and construe my promises according to the unequivocal import of the words in which they are conveyed, and that you are at liberty to make such use of this Letter as you may think proper.

I am, Dear Sir, ever faithfully your friend

J. Q. ADAMS.

XXIV.

ALEXANDER H. EVERETT Esq<sup>r</sup> Boston.

WASHINGTON 1. December 1835

*Dear Sir.*

I have received your Letter of the 25<sup>th</sup> ult<sup>o</sup> mentioning that you had given a Letter of introduction to me to Mr Fisk late Editor of the

<sup>1</sup> Antimasonic. McCarthy, *op. cit.*, p. 520.

*Reformer* Newspaper. He has not yet delivered the Letter, and I have not heard of his arrival here. I think I have recently heard something of the Paper, but do not recollect ever having seen it. What were the *Reforms*, which it patronized or recommended?

There have been of late years a goodly number of Editors and correspondents of the daily Journals in most of the Northern cities who have passed their winters at Washington, and who from time to time have entertained the public with intelligence from the Metropolis of the Union. I find it announced that the Editor of the Bangor Whig and Courier, and one of the Editors of the Boston Atlas are to be of the corresponding corps during the approaching Session of Congress. Judging of the future from the past it may be expected that their communications will be sufficiently indicative of the purposes for which they are employed, and of the services they are to perform. Whether Mr Fisk proposes to pass the winter here, or is to be a correspondent of any Journalist, I may probably learn from himself.

It gives me pleasure to learn that you also propose to pay a visit here in the course of the Winter. It will be an interesting object to you to know what the different parties which will be assembled here have in prospect before them; and what the result of all their collisions and combinations will be likely to turn out. As yet we see little more than the crumbling of the political parties as they have existed under this administration, into ruin. There must be during the approaching Session of Congress a new composition of parties, and it is scarcely possible yet to foresee what that will be.

Mr Van Buren is the candidate of the Democracy—so self styled; and although that party have not always been true to their name, and have often mistaken their friends for their foes, and vice versa, they have when acting in concert always ruled the Country; and always bestowed the great Offices of Government Legislative and Executive. But Democracy, in our history, has hitherto been the great Engine of the South to controul and manage the affairs of the whole Union. Heretofore they have succeeded in all but two instances in securing the Presidency to one of their own number, and the Office of Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States has also for the last thirty-five years been held by one of them. *He* was however not of the democracy. He was a federalist, and by his great talents, and his personal influence and popularity has during the whole of that time held the democracy in check. There is every reason to fear that this state of things is now to be reversed. That the next Chief Justice will be not only a Southern Slave holder, but a convert from rank federalism to rank democracy and a man of exceedingly doubtful moral principle.<sup>1</sup> On the other hand, if the democracy of the South go for Van Buren, he will certainly be elected. There are indications favourable to him both in the South and the West, the sources of which I look to with some distrust. A North-

<sup>1</sup> The allusion is to Taney.

ern man, elected by Southern and Western Democracy presents no very auspicious futurity for the local interests and even the rights of the North. Mr Van Buren is pledged to support the principles of the Jackson Administration—Pledged to uncompromising hostility to the Bank of the United States—pledged to unqualified Anti-Slavery abolition—Pledged I greatly fear to sacrifice the Public Lands to the grasping temper of the new Western States. I have no personal relations with him beyond the exchange of a visit or a card, and seek none. You have not the same motives for keeping aloof from him; and when you come here, you will have opportunities of meeting and conversing with him, and of satisfying yourself whether upon the cardinal points of policy to which I have alluded, better hopes can be entertained than I have been able to conceive or to encourage.

The opposition to Van Buren consists 1. Of part of the Southern democracy; deserters from Jacksonism, in two divisions. One of Calhoun nullifiers, chiefly confined to South-Carolina, but entirely controuling that State. The other of *White* Tennesseans, drawn off from the same party, by the late Speaker John Bell. They will probably unite all the *servile* votes of the South. I mean all the votes which will be biassed exclusively by Slave-holding passion, prejudice and panic—and they will not be few. These two divisions will perhaps melt up into one. 2. Of Western *Clay* Democrats—or rather of all the Clay Democrats. This party got up the late Baltimore triumphal banquet, and the Meeting at Philadelphia, headed by Col<sup>l</sup> Watmough and Josiah Randall. This party appears to be now very weak; and likely to be overawed into submission to another 3. The Webster federalists. All the remnants of blue-light federalism have rallied together and made Webster their forlorn hope. Clay as you know rose upon the broadest shoulders of democracy. But his European Expedition tinged both his principles and his deportment with Aristocracy—perhaps to the improvement of his character, but to the loss of his standing with the Democracy. It is now again said that he will yield his pretensions as a Candidate for the Presidency; and that his party will support Webster. As it is very certain that neither of them can be elected, it may be Mr Clay's policy to acquiesce in giving Mr Webster the chief command, with the certainty of defeat. Nothing else can possibly effect the amalgamation of Clay democracy, with Webster federalism. 4. The Pennsylvania and perhaps the Vermont Anti-masons. In both States however the Anti-masons are exceedingly divided, and I think there is no prospect of their uniting upon any Candidate for the Presidency. The result may be to break up the anti-masonic party in both those States. 5. The Wolf portion of the Pennsylvania democracy. I believe it was the opposition to Van Buren, which principally, if not wholly caused the schism between the Wolf and Muhlenberg democrats. Whether they can be reunited or not can scarcely be foreseen till the meeting of Congress, and of the Legislature of Pennsylvania. It is needless to say that of these five parties all opposed to Van Buren, there are no two that hold any

great political principle in common. Most of them call themselves whigs, only for the sake of calling their adversaries Tories.

The Antimasons of Massachusetts after presenting to the whigs a Candidate for the Office of Governor,<sup>1</sup> and uniting with them to elect him, have wisely withdrawn from all further association with them, especially with regard to the Presidency. The Government of the State is yet in the hands of the Whigs, but how they will manage it is subject to ominous conjecture. The mere Jackson party has not only been a very small, but internally a much divided party, with this peculiar property that the interest and the policy of its leaders has been to keep the party as small as possible; to engross all the lucrative offices to themselves. How far Mr Van Buren will be disposed to countenance and sustain this policy, I am unable to say. You will have no difficulty however in ascertaining, if you come here in the course of the winter.

The whigs of Boston have done themselves no service by relieving you from your labours as a member of the Legislature. They will call for them again when they get rid of some of their *Notions*. I have read with much interest your Speech in Faneuil-Hall, and have been amused with the castigation, of the Daily Advertiser, and Centinel for having dared to publish it. In what condition must a party be driven to such expedients to gag the freedom of their own Press? What must be the moral principle of a party, so convulsed at the admission of every ray of light? I perceive they are shockingly scandalized too at your consenting to deliver an Address at Salem, on the 8<sup>th</sup> of January.<sup>2</sup> Their treachery to you sits heavy on their Souls; and as usual they are labouring to transform it into your treachery to them.

I trust you will hold the even tenour of your way, heedless alike of their censure or their applause. Whoever adheres to *principle*, must make up his mind to be charged with inconsistency and apostasy for every refusal to be hand-cuffed with the manacles of party, and when allegiance to men, is made the only standard of political orthodoxy, the praise or blame of the hirelings of the press, stimulated from behind the Scenes and paid for by the paragraph are equally worthless and contemptible.

I am, Dear Sir, very respectfully yours J. Q. ADAMS.

XXV.

ALEXANDER H. EVERETT Esq<sup>r</sup> Boston

WASHINGTON 10 May 1836

*My dear Sir*

Your Letter of the 29<sup>th</sup> ult<sup>o</sup> from Norfolk House Roxbury has been some days received. Your new arrangements with regard to your future residence, seem to me in every point of view judicious, and I heartily wish you may find them result as successfully to yourself as you can

<sup>1</sup> Edward Everett.

<sup>2</sup> Alexander H. Everett, *An Address delivered at Salem, on the Eighth of January, 1836, in Commemoration of the Victory of New Orleans* (Boston, 1836).

desire. The treatment which you have received from the political party with which since your last return from Europe you have been associated has given me more and deeper concern than that which I have experienced from them myself. As a man so much younger, and with a long career of capacity for public usefulness before you, I have felt your removal from the service of our Country as a misfortune to her, while my own, at this time can scarcely be an anticipation of the natural and necessary course of Events. Whether your residence in the County of Norfolk, will by the Constitution of the Commonwealth be of sufficient duration to make you eligible from that District to Congress at the ensuing election next November, I cannot say, but as I understand Mr Jackson<sup>1</sup> intends to decline being a candidate for re-election, nothing could give me more cordial pleasure than that you should be his successor. What the state of parties in the District will be cannot even now be very clearly foreseen. The Presidential Election would seem to be ascertained, by the result of the recent elections in Connecticut, Rhode-Island and Virginia, though some doubts are said to have arisen from adverse indications in those of New-York, and though new questions of very grave and threatening aspect, are starting up, as if by evil enchantment, which may yet have unexpected bearings upon the issue of the Election. A knot of Florida Indians, probably not five hundred, perhaps not three hundred in number have absorbed all the energies of our whole standing army, with large bodies of auxiliary militia, and cannot be found. Six Generals and at least ten thousand men have been four months in search of them, and they are as *introuvables* as the famous chamber of deputies of Louis 18. They have in the meantime but too fatally found some of our citizens habitations, and some of our ill-fated detachments of troops, whom they have scalped and tomahawked according to the custom of their tender mercies. Two Millions of dollars of appropriation extraordinary have already been swallowed up, by this miniature cormora[nt]<sup>2</sup> and nothing has been done;—there is not even a prospect that this invisible wa[r]<sup>2</sup> will terminate the present year, and the climate is already committing ravages among our troops, more terrible than the savages themselves.

In the meantime another and far more portentous War, has blazed up, with the suddenness of a faggot fire kindled in a forest. It is close upon our Southern border, and we are in the most imminent danger of being involved in its conflagration. Two Millions of dollars have already been voted by the House of Representatives in preparation to meet its blast; a second Regiment of dragoons has been added to the standing Army of the Union, and the President of the United States has been authorised for three years to accept the services and to saddle the Country with the burden of supporting ten thousand Volunteers of the Militia of the Western States. So suddenly have these measures flashed upon us that neither of the two Bills has passed the Senate, though both have

<sup>1</sup> William Jackson of Newton.

<sup>2</sup> Paper torn.

passed the house with extreme precipitation. The last Million appropriation Bill in one day—last Saturday. The nature and causes of this War, were then also for the first time partially disclosed by communications from the Executive, and it threatens to be nothing less than a foreign, a civil, a servile and an Indian war combined in one. And that of this War, we have been or are to be the aggressors. It is on our part a War with Mexico, for the re-establishment of Slavery in the province of Texas, and for the conquest and annexation of Texas, and of other portions of Mexico to our Union, and the re-subjugation of emancipated Slaves, and the conquest of the Mexican Provinces, and their annexation as slave-holding States of our Union, and the extermination of the Indians whom we have been driving like swine into a pen West of the Mississippi, are all parts of one System of War policy, bursting upon us at this moment. In this state of things I must not look back, for clashing opinions with Mr Webster or any other Northern man. My conflict now is with the nullifier and Slave-holder, and with their conjoint system of policy, and this conflict has already commenced. I have taken my stand; and in the debate of last Saturday, wretchedly reported both in the Globe and Intelligencer, you will yet see what passed between Mr Thompson of South-Carolina, aided by Mr Balie Peyton of Tennessee, and me. Thompson is the Prince of nullifiers in the House. Balie Peyton is the Ajax of the White standard. Harrison has already lost a Son in this Mexican War, and *some* at least of his friends in the House are infected with its frenzy. Mr Webster has not yet spoken but his friends in the House upon this point are all with me. That is they vote with me, though they have not forgiven me for demolishing their *Chateaux en Espagne* for the next President.

My resolution of 22<sup>d</sup> January<sup>1</sup> therefore still sleeps on the Speaker's table as it did when you left this place. The Appropriation Bills and other measures of the first urgency, have occupied the House incessantly since January, and in the meantime other objects of deliberation have arisen upon which my views have not been conformable to those of the ruling majority in the House. I incline therefore both from principle and policy to use forbearance towards Mr Webster, and to suffer the vituperations of his friends in the House to pass without reply. The shallow and inconsistent pretences upon which the three Million Appropriation was rejected in the Senate have been totally abandoned; the opposition majority have melted into a minority, and the Webster whigs of our own delegation, have so thoroughly parted from their nullifying, White and Harrison associates, that all the important purposes of my Resolution have been attained, and I could secure nothing by pressing

<sup>1</sup> "Resolved, That so much of the message of the President of the United States to Congress at the commencement of the present session, as relates to the failure, at the last session of Congress, of the bill containing the ordinary appropriations for fortifications, be referred to a select committee, with instructions to inquire into, and report to the House, the causes and circumstances of the failure of that bill."

the subject further but a personal triumph, which the ruling majority themselves may not be more willing to aid me in gaining than their adversaries. If any thing *now* remains necessary for my defence, I shall rather prefer to address it to my Constituents through the Press.

For your anniversary Address at Bunker's Hill I have no suggestion to offer you, which could even claim admission among those which will present themselves to your own mind. You will not fall into commonplace bragging with which the theme is redundant, and you know too well how to temper panegyrick with philosophy, to require a leading idea of restraint upon the propensity merely to admire and to condemn.

I have expected our Session would close about the last of this Month, but if the cloud on our Southwestern frontier should not clear away, we shall hardly separate before the 1<sup>st</sup> of July. We have important appropriation Bills yet on hand.

I remain, very faithfully yours

J. Q. ADAMS.

## XXVI.

A H. EVERETT Esq<sup>r</sup> Norfolk House Roxbury, Mass<sup>ts</sup>

WASHINGTON 7. Nov<sup>r</sup> 1837

*Dear Sir*

I received a few days since your Letter of 20. Oct<sup>r</sup> enclosing a number of the Norfolk Argus, and I had a few days before received your address to the Literary Society at Providence,<sup>1</sup> which I read with great pleasure.

Your view of the contrasted character of the Literature of the 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> centuries is highly interesting, and I *hope* on the whole correct. I am under some apprehension that it sees the philosophy of the age in fairer colours than the reality will warrant. I have taken as yet no cognizance of Monsieur Cousin's system and I have been impressed with a painful idea, that the sense of religion is almost entirely extinguished in France. I observe that you have not noticed Benjamin Constant's work upon Religion—nor Lord Bolingbroke, among the infidel writers of the last age.

Speculative atheism is the most unfortunate of all religions, for it can make its appeal to no honest motive in the human heart. If the creed of the atheist were true, man would have no good reason for believing it, for truth itself would lose all its value. Right and Wrong, have no meaning, but for a responsible hereafter, and that responsibility depends entirely upon the existence of a moral ruler of the Universe. Man is the only animated being on this globe, who has the sense of Right and Wrong. Take that from him, and his Law is the Law of the Tyger, the Shark, the Vulture and the Rattlesnake. The question between the Atheist and the Deist, is beyond the solution of human reason.

<sup>1</sup> A. H. Everett, *An Address to the Philermenian Society of Brown University, on the Moral Character of the Literature of the last and present Century*, delivered at Providence, September 4, 1837 (Boston, 1837).

Voltaire's only reason for believing the existence of a God was that he could not conceive of a watch without a watchmaker. But when he had the watchmaker, how could he conceive of him without a prior cause. *In the beginning*, says the Book of Genesis, God created the Heaven and the earth. But what was before *the beginning*?

Ante mare et tellus, et quod tegit omnia coelum,

Unus erat toto Naturae vultus in orbe,

Quem dixere Chaos;

says Ovid—but what was before Chaos? The foundation of moral principle is not in the belief of the existence of a God, but in that of man's responsibility to him, and a future state of retribution. Voltaire did not believe this. He believed in a creator of the Universe; but not in his moral Government.

Bolingbroke says that it is desirable to believe in a future state, but that all the phenomena of Nature are against it.

Benjamin Constant argues against all religious principle; but shrinks from his own conclusions. He disclaims infidelity, and professes to believe as much as the protestant faith requires.

Hume, Diderot, D'Alembert, Mirabeau the father, d'Holbach, Condorcet, were cold blooded Atheists, and could therefore have no steady system of morals. The Morals of England in the last age were chiefly sustained by Dr Johnson and Burke; and since them by Mackintosh.

The Morals of France, I fear are very bad, precisely because there is no basis of Religion for them to rest upon. There is a fearful looking for of judgment in Tocqueville's Book on Democracy, as well as in Benjamin [*sic*] Constant. Beranger's Songs are as licentious as any thing in Voltaire or La Fontaine.

The application of your discourse, in your peroration to the young men whom you addressed is admirable.

I wish I could as [*sic*] concur as cordially with you, in the political opinions, which are dividing the Country at this time, as in your views of the Literature of the last and of the present century. The Resolution of the Democratic Convention at Worcester against the annexation of Texas, and the Resolution of the Norfolk Convention, approving my course with regard to the right of petition, were grateful to me, and are entitled to my highest respect. Nor is it without pain that I differ so essentially as I do from the other Resolutions adopted on those two occasions. I had hoped that the calamities brought upon the Country by the headstrong passions, and self-idolizing ignorance of the last Administration, would have operated as a warning to the present.

The leading measures of the administration at the recent Session of Congress have been in my judgment so unwise and so unjust that I found myself compelled to take a stand of the most decided resistance against them. My Speeches in both cases will be published and shew the grounds of my opposition. The extreme injustice of withholding from the Northern States the 4<sup>th</sup> instalment of the deposit act and of releasing the Southmost and Western States from the obligations of

paying that same money, unaccountably suffered to be accumulated in their banks, was so disgusting to me, that I could not endure to see it unproved, especially when I ascertained that the real intention was to deprive the Northern States of the fourth instalment altogether.

I would have consented to a delay of the fourth instalment, and have voted, for both the bills, and for the Treasury Note Bill, if the Administration would have consented by an appropriation of funds to secure the payment at the day, which they were obliged to fix for the term of postponement. They inflexibly refused this pledge, and lost 60 or 70 votes, for their three bills. Upon so small a concession the Administration could have carried all their measures except the divorce or sub-treasury by four fifths of the whole house.

As to the sub-treasury—Bedlam seems to me to be the only place where it could have originated. A War with the *Money* Power, to provide for the collecting, keeping, and disbursing the *Money* of the Nation. A Divorce of Bank and State! Why a divorce of Trade and Shipping would be as wise to carry on the business of a merchant. A divorce of Army and Fire-Arms, in the face of an invading enemy, a divorce of Law and a Bench of Judges to carry into execution the Statutes of the Land, would be as reasonable! But I must refrain.

The movements of the nullification party here, and of their head have not served to recommend the Subtreasury Scheme to the friends of the Union. It came into the House, under the patronage of ultra-nullification. And this, exactly cotemporaneous with a Southern Convention held at Augusta in Georgia against the Commerce and Merchants of the North.

May the day be not remote when we shall harmonize in political opinions, not less than in the estimate of past and present Literature; and may your prospects in future, whether political or literary be prosperous and happy.

Ever your friend

J. Q. ADAMS.